

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,784		06/19/2001	Tsutomu Kono	16869S028400	2346
20350	7590	06/02/2003			
		TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
EIGHTH F	LOOR	RO CENTER		NGO, HUNG V	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-38		A 94111-3834		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2831	
				DATE MAIL ED: 06/02/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

am

Application No. 09/884,784

Applicant(s)

Kono et al

# Office Action Summary

Examiner

Hung V. Ngo

Art Unit 2831



	The WAILING DATE OF this Communication appears	m the tover sheet with the correspondence address
	for Reply	TO EVAIDE 2 MONTHUS SPOM
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
		no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If the	g date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th	
	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause th	
- Any re	ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
Status	patent term adjustment. Good of Griff 1770 (15).	
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 3, 20	03
2a) 💢	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action	on is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex par	xcept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is to Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 14-17</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-17	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗌	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	ation Papers	
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) $\square$ approved b) $\square$ disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) [	☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	
	1. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.
	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Bure	
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	
_	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
	The translation of the foreign language provisiona	
15)∟	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachm		4) Teaching Common (DTO 412) Deven No.
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (P10-152)  6) Other:
31 🗀 IU.	romation disclosure Statement(s) (FTO-1443) Paper No(s).	of Cotton

Application/Control Number: 09/884784

Art Unit: 2831

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4-6, 7-9, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 9, 10, "said one or more side walls" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 1, line 11, "port" is unclear. Is it --part--?

Claim 4, "components", "a first component", "a second component" is not clearly understood. As discussed in the specification "a component" (page 6)

Claim 4, line 7, delete --,--.

Claim 6, lines 7, 8, "not joined to said second sidewall" is not clearly understood. As shown in Figs. 1, 9, first and second sidewalls of the metal base board joined the component (2).

Claim 6, "components" have similar problems.

Claim 9, "components" have similar problems.

Claim 15, "components" have similar problems.

Claims 4, 5, 6, 8, 14 are not considered over the prior art because of 35 USC 112 problems.

Application/Control Number: 09/884784 Page 3

Art Unit: 2831

Claims 5, 7, 8, 14 are included because of their dependencies.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarraf

Sarraf discloses a metal base board (12) including a first and second main surfaces, having at least one through hole (17) having concave shape (re claim 9), first and second sidewalls being separate by a space, first and second terminal parts being provided with a convex shape or concave shape extending substantially perpendicular to the first main surface, at least one component being jointed to the metal base board (Fig 1)(re claims 1, 2), a circuit card (26)(re claim 15).

Re claim 7, a notch (Fig 1).

The limitations of "an outsert-molding process" have been considered. The presence of process limitations in product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to that product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965).

Application/Control Number: 09/884784 Page 4

Art Unit: 2831

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3, 16, 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarraf.

Sarraf discloses a metal base board (12) including a plurality of sidewalls or vertical extensions (1), first and second sidewalls being separated by a space (Fig 1), a non metallic layer (10) (re claim 3).

Re claim 16, a protrusion (12)(Fig 1).

Re claim 17, wherein, the housing of Sarraf is capable of functioning as claimed (Fig 1).

The teaching of Sarraf as discussed above does not disclose the non metallic layer made of thermoplastic.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use thermoplastic for the plastic housing of Sarraf for intended purpose, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Art Unit: 2831

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (703) 308-7614. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 am to 06:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard, can be reached on (703) 308-3682.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9318 (Before Final) or (703) 872-9319 (After Final).

Art Unit: 2831

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Hung V. Ngo

May 28, 2003

Ha VNa

HUNG V. NGO PRIMARY EXAMINER